



A


AT&T Communications Switches Serving Virginia




TCG Switches Serving Virginia



Media One Switch Serving Virginia



Verizon Tandems Serving Virginia



B

Statement of Qualifications

David L. Talbott

Mr. David L. Talbott has been involved in the telecommunications industry for more than twenty-five years. He is a District Manager in AT&T Network Services. He has presented testimony on local network interconnection before many state commissions and is recognized within AT&T as an expert on these matters.

EDUCATION

Mr. Talbott graduated from the University of Maryland – College Park in 1975 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree from the Communications Department.

RELATED WORK EXPERIENCE

Mr. Talbott started with AT&T Long Lines Department in 1976. From 1979 through 1988 he held various management positions in engineering related to the design and implementation of private line services. From 1988 through 1998 he was responsible for developing and managing numerous business relationships between AT&T and selected Competitive Access Providers and Competitive Local Exchange Carriers. His responsibilities required that he address and resolve both technical and business issues, including the interconnection of the respective networks.

During 1999, Mr. Talbott, was the Business Development Manager for AT&T's Internet Protocol Cable Telephony Project. His responsibilities included the assessment of the technical capabilities of selected vendors and contracting the best qualified vendors to assist AT&T in its development of Internet Protocol cable telephony technology.

EXHIBIT DLT-1

As of September 1999, Mr. Talbott was assigned to his current position, where he is responsible for the development and negotiation of interconnection agreements between AT&T and ILECs, focusing on network interconnection issues.

REGULATORY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Talbott has provided testimony before: the California Public Utilities Commission; the Florida Public Service Commission; the Georgia Public Service Commission; the Kansas Corporation Commission; the Michigan Public Service Commission; the New York Public Service Commission; the North Carolina Public Utilities Commission; the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio; the Texas Public Utility Commission; and the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.



C

Table of Contents

ISSUE	PAGE
NETWORK ARCHITECTURE	
Issue I.1 <i>Point of Interconnection</i> Should each Party be financially responsible for all of the costs associated with its originating traffic that terminates on the other Parties' network; regardless of the location and/or number of points of interconnection, as long as there is at least one Point of Interconnection per LATA?	8
Sub-Issue I.1A <i>End Office Interconnection</i> Can Verizon force AT&T to establish a Point of Interconnection at a particular end office, when AT&T traffic to that end office reaches a certain threshold traffic level?	47
Issue III.1 <i>Tandem Transit Service</i> Does Verizon have an obligation to provide transit service to AT&T for the exchange of local traffic with other carriers, regardless of the level of traffic exchanged between AT&T and the other carriers?	53
Issue III.2 <i>Transit Pricing</i> Should transit services be priced at TELRIC, regardless of the level of traffic exchanged between AT&T and other carriers?	60
Issue I.3 <i>AT&T's Transit Obligations</i> Should AT&T have a reciprocal duty to provide transit services to Verizon?	64
Issue V.1 <i>Competitive Tandem Service</i> Should Verizon be permitted to place restrictions on UNEs so as to preclude AT&T from providing competitive tandem services?	66
Issue III.3 <i>Meet Point Interconnection</i> Should the selection of a fiber meet point method of interconnection (jointly engineered and operated as a SONET ring) be at AT&T's discretion or be subject to the mutual agreement of the parties?	71
Sub-Issue III.3.A. <i>Meet Point Interconnection</i> Should Mid-Span Fiber Meet facilities be established within 120 days from the initial mid-span implementation meeting?	75
Issue V.2 <i>Interconnection Transport</i> What is the appropriate rate for Verizon to charge AT&T for transport purchased by AT&T for purposes of interconnection – the UNE transport rate or the carrier access rate?	77
Sub-Issue III.4.B. <i>Trunk Disconnection</i> Should Verizon have the unilateral ability to terminate trunk groups to AT&T if Verizon determines that the trunks groups are underutilized?	83

EXHIBIT DLT-2

INTERCARRIER COMPENSATION	
Issue I.6 <i>Virtual FX Traffic</i> Is the jurisdiction of a call determined by the NPA-NXXs of the calling and called numbers?	88
Issue III.5 <i>Tandem Rate</i> Where the geographic coverage of an AT&T switch is comparable to that of a Verizon tandem, should AT&T and Verizon receive comparable reciprocal compensation for terminating the other parties' traffic?	102
Issue V.8 <i>Competitive Tandem Service</i> Should the contract terms relating to the Parties' joint provision of terminating meet point traffic to an IXC customer be reciprocal, regardless of which Party provides the tandem switching function? Put another way, should the contract terms make clear that AT&T and Verizon are peer local exchange carriers and should not bill one another for meet point traffic?	112
VERIZON ADDITIONAL ISSUES	
Issue VII-1 <i>AT&T Revised Contract Language</i> Should AT&T be allowed to circumvent over a year's worth of negotiations by inserting language on Network Architecture issues that was never discussed by the Parties?	119
Issue VII-2 <i>Demand Management Forecasts</i> Should the Parties' interconnection agreement reflect their recent agreement on Demand Management Forecasts?	130
Issue VII-3 <i>Definitions of POI and IP</i> How should the Parties Define "Interconnection Points" ("IP") and "Points of Interconnection" ("POI")?	134
Issue VII-4 <i>AT&T Transport Rates - 1</i> If AT&T fails to establish an Interconnection Point in accordance with the terms of the interconnection agreement, what reciprocal compensation rates and/or inter-carrier compensation rates should Verizon pay AT&T?	136
Issue VII-5 <i>AT&T Transport Rates - 2</i> When AT&T offers a limited number of IPs, should AT&T be permitted to charge Verizon distance-sensitive charges if Verizon purchases transport to an AT&T IP?	136
Issue VII-6 <i>Limitations on AT&T's POI</i> Should Verizon be forced to offer interconnection facilities and hubbing at central offices other than those intermediate hub locations identified in the NECA 4 tariff?	141

D

EXHIBIT DLT-3

VERIZON NETWORK ARCHITECTURE






EXHIBIT DLT-4

AT&T NETWORK ARCHITECTURE





E

Verizon Virginia, Inc.

Special Access Dedicated Transport Rates (Zone 1, Three-Year Term)

Versus

UNE Transport Rates

<u>Interstate Special Access</u>	<u>Rate</u>
DS-1 Channel Termination	\$176.55
DS-1 Channel Mileage	
Fixed	\$38.89
Per Mile	\$14.32
DS-3 Channel Termination	\$2,475.00
DS-3 Channel Mileage	
Fixed	\$742.50
Per Mile	\$139.53
 <u>UNE</u>	 <u>Rate</u>
DS-1 Dedicated Transport	
Entrance Facilities	\$119.15
Interoffice Facilities	\$ 35.10
DS-3 Dedicated Transport	
Entrance Facilities	\$767.44
Interoffice Facilities	\$604.53

Verizon Virginia, Inc.

Special Access Dedicated Transport Rates (Zone 1, Three-Year Term)

Versus

UNE Transport Rates

DS-1 Rate Comparison	Special Access	UNE	Difference
Ten-Mile Circuit	\$358.64	\$154.25	\$204.39
Fifty-Mile circuit	\$931.44	\$154.25	\$777.19

DS-3 Rate Comparison	Special Access	UNE	Difference
Ten-Mile Circuit	\$4,612.80	\$1,371.97	\$3,240.83
Fifty-Mile Circuit	\$10,194.00	\$1,371.97	\$8,822.03

F

Terms Applicable Competitive Tandem Service

The following terms are to be added to Schedule 4, Part B: INTERCONNECTION ARCHITECTURE

- 6 COMPETITIVE TANDEM SERVICE – Upon request by AT&T, the Parties will establish two-way competitive-tandem trunk groups separate from ESIT trunk groups, to carry traffic between AT&T's switched access customer connected to AT&T's switch and Verizon's local customers. Such trunks will be established in GR-394-CORE format. The Parties agree that the following provisions will apply to the switching and transport of competitive-tandem traffic:
- 6.1 Verizon will provide to AT&T UNE local switching, tandem switching and transport of Feature Group D calls from end-users who have chosen an IXC that is connected to the AT&T's tandem switch.
- 6.2 The charges applicable to the functions provided by Verizon to AT&T will be in accordance with [UNE pricing section of Agreement – need cite].
- 6.3 Verizon may bill AT&T directly for the UNEs ordered by AT&T.
- 6.4 AT&T shall direct traffic received from Switched Access customers directly to Verizon's end office serving the called party where such connection exists and is available. Where no such end office connection exists or is available, AT&T may direct such traffic to Verizon's tandem serving the called party's end office.
- 6.5 Upon request from AT&T, Verizon shall provide the Carrier Identification Parameter option with competitive-tandem trunk groups ordered by AT&T, so that the primary customer's carrier identification code (CIC) or the CIC designated by the origination of the call will be sent to AT&T in the initial address message of the common channel signaling protocol.
- 6.6 The Parties will exchange SS7 signaling messages with one another, where and as available. The Parties will provide all line information signaling parameters including, but not limited to, Calling Party Number, Charge Number (if it is different from calling party number), and originating line information ("OLI"). For terminating FGD, the Parties will pass any CPN they receive from other carriers. All privacy indicators will be honored. Where available, network signaling information such as Transit Network Selection ("TNS") parameter (SS7 environment) will be provided by the end office Party wherever such information is needed for call routing or billing. Where TNS information has not been provided by AT&T, Verizon will route originating Switched Access traffic to the IXC

EXHIBIT DLT-9

using available translations. The Parties will follow all industry Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) adopted guidelines pertaining to TNS codes.

The following terms are to replace Schedule 4, Part B, Section 4.

- 4 MEET POINT TRAFFIC - The Parties will establish two-way meet point trunk groups separate from ESIT trunk groups, to carry Meet Point Traffic. The trunks will be established in GR-394-CORE format. The Parties agree that the following provisions will apply to the switching and transport of Meet Point Traffic:
 - 4.1 AT&T will provide local switching and, at its discretion, transport of Feature Group B and D calls from AT&T end-users who have chosen an IXC that is connected to Verizon's tandem switch.
 - 4.2 Verizon will provide, tandem switching and, if so requested by AT&T, transport of Feature Group B and D calls from AT&T end-users who have chosen an IXC that is connected to Verizon's tandem switch.
 - 4.3 Neither Party will charge the other for the use of its facilities, and the Parties will each bill the IXC customer in accordance with MECOD/MECAB guidelines.
 - 4.4 Neither Party will have the responsibility for ensuring that the Switched Access Service customer accepts or pays for the traffic billed by the other Party.
 - 4.5 Verizon shall direct traffic received from Switched Access customers directly to AT&T's end office serving the called party where such connection exists and is available.
 - 4.6 Originating Feature Group B calls delivered to either Party's tandem shall use GR-317-CORE signaling format unless the associated FGB carrier employs GR-394-CORE signaling for its FGB traffic at the serving access tandem.
 - 4.7 The Parties will exchange SS7 signaling messages with one another, where and as available. The Parties will provide all line information signaling parameters including, but not limited to, Calling Party Number, Charge Number (if it is different from calling party number), and originating line information ("OLI"). For terminating FGD, either Party will pass any CPN it receives from other carriers. All privacy indicators will be honored. Where available, network signaling information such as Transit Network Selection ("TNS") parameter (SS7 environment) will be provided by the end office Party wherever such information is needed for call routing or billing. Where TNS information has not been provided by the end office Party, the tandem Party will route originating Switched

EXHIBIT DLT-9

Access traffic to the IXC using available translations. The Parties will follow all industry Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) adopted guidelines pertaining to TNS codes.

G

	VIRGINIA NETWORK INTERCONNECTION COST ANALYSIS	
--	---	--

COSTS ALLOCATED TO EACH PARTY UNDER AT&T PROPOSAL

	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ
DEOT	\$392,992	\$566,947	\$392,992	\$608,766	\$392,992	\$675,391	\$392,992	\$733,229	\$392,992	\$785,912
Tandem 1	\$65,086	\$504,013	\$117,638	\$511,253	\$117,638	\$548,955	\$164,995	\$546,761	\$171,541	\$582,754
FG-D	\$267,469	\$23,881	\$300,903	\$23,881	\$329,561	\$28,657	\$358,218	\$28,657	\$382,099	\$33,434
Total	\$725,548	\$1,094,841	\$811,533	\$1,143,900	\$840,191	\$1,253,004	\$916,205	\$1,308,647	\$946,632	\$1,402,099
Collective Total	\$1,820,389		\$1,955,434		\$2,093,194		\$2,224,853		\$2,348,731	

COSTS ALLOCATED TO EACH PARTY UNDER VERIZON PROPOSAL

Using primary (tandem overflow) end office groups

	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ
DEOT	\$959,939	\$0	1001758	\$0	1068383	\$0	1126221	\$0	1178904	\$0
Tandem 2	\$1,366,764	\$0	\$1,672,345	\$0	\$1,754,912	\$0	\$1,792,098	\$0	\$2,275,244	\$0
FG-D	\$291,351	\$0	\$324,784	\$0	\$358,218	\$0	\$386,875	\$0	\$415,533	\$0
Total	\$2,618,054	\$0	\$2,998,887	\$0	\$3,181,513	\$0	\$3,305,195	\$0	\$3,869,681	\$0
Collective Total	\$2,618,054		\$2,998,887		\$3,181,513		\$3,305,195		\$3,869,681	

This work sheet summarizes the allocation of network interconnection costs as proposed by each party. Detailed cost basis for this summary is provided on the four associated worksheets as labeled.

CONFIDENTIAL

COSTS ALLOCATED TO EACH PARTY UNDER VERIZON PROPOSAL

Using final (no tandem overflow) end office groups

	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ	AT&T	VZ
DEOT	\$959,939	\$0	\$1,001,758	\$0	\$1,068,383	\$0	\$1,126,221	\$0	\$1,178,904	\$0
Tandem 3	\$2,909,717	\$0	\$3,345,696	\$0	\$3,682,710	\$0	\$3,846,518	\$0	\$4,080,602	\$0
FG-D	\$291,351	\$0	\$324,784	\$0	\$358,218	\$0	\$386,875	\$0	\$415,533	\$0
Total	\$4,161,006	\$0	\$4,672,238	\$0	\$5,109,311	\$0	\$5,359,615	\$0	\$5,675,039	\$0
Collective Total	\$4,161,006		\$4,672,238		\$5,109,311		\$5,359,615		\$5,675,039	

AT&T MONTHLY PER LINE COSTS FOR 2001

Under AT&T Proposal	\$0.94
Under Verizon Proposal with tandem overflow	\$3.41
Under Verizon Proposal without tandem overflow	\$5.42

CONFIDENTIAL

H

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of
Petition of AT&T Communications
of Virginia, Inc., Pursuant
to Section 252(e)(5) of the
Communications Act, for Preemption
of the Jurisdiction of the Virginia
State Corporation Commission
Regarding Interconnection Disputes
with Verizon-Virginia, Inc.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

CC Docket No. 00-251

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 31st day of July, 2001, a copy of testimony of Michael C. Pfau, David L. Talbott, Robert Kirchberger, Edward C. Nurse, and William Solis filed on behalf of AT&T Communications of Virginia, Inc. and its affiliates listed above was sent via hand delivery, Federal Express and/or by email to:

Dorothy Attwood, Chief
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 5-C450
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20544

Jodie L. Kelley, Esq.
Jenner and Block
601 13th Street, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20005
(for WorldCom)

Jeffrey Dygert
Assistant Bureau Chief
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 5-C317
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20544

Jill Butler
Vice President of Regulatory Affairs
Cox Communications, Inc.
4585 Village Avenue
Norfolk, Virginia 23502

Katherine Farroba, Deputy Chief
Policy and Program Planning Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 5-B125
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20544

Karen Zacharia, Esq.
Verizon, Inc.
1320 North Court House Road
Eighth Floor
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Mark A. Keffer